

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/627,759
Response filed May 4, 2005
Reply to OA dated February 11, 2005

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are currently being considered in the present application, of which claims 1, 2, and 4 have been amended. No new claims have been added. Applicant believes that no new matter has been introduced.

Claims 1, 2, and 4 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over USP 5,076,467 (**Sugo**) in view of USP 2,437,963 (**Langmuir**) or USP 5,186,120 (**Ohnishi**).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection of claims 1, 2, and 4.

Sugo, Langmuir, and Ohnishi, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the following features set forth in claim 1, as amended: "A steam-supplying apparatus for hairdressing and beauty care, comprising: ... the steam-generating portion sending pressurized steam through the electromagnetic valve and the connecting tube, and forcibly blowing the steam out of the steam-blowing portion, the electromagnetic valve being disposed between the tube and the steam-generating portion, the tube being flexible and being disposed between the electromagnetic valve and the steam-blowing portion; a heating steam circulation passage, disposed in the electromagnetic valve, conveying the steam from the steam-generating portion through the electromagnetic valve and then to a return pipe, preliminarily heating an inside of the electromagnetic valve with the steam from the steam-generating portion when the electromagnetic

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/627,759
Response filed May 4, 2005
Reply to OA dated February 11, 2005

valve is in a closed state; and an electric heater, disposed in the steam-blowing portion, to heat a vaporization space in the steam-blowing portion, the electric heater changing water drops to steam in the vaporization space”, in combination with the other claimed features.

Sugo, Langmuir, and Ohnishi, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the following features set forth in claim 4, as amended: “A steam-supplying apparatus, comprising: ... the electromagnetic valve forming a heating steam circulation passage inside the electromagnetic valve to heat the inside of the electromagnetic valve with the steam from the steam-generating portion when the electromagnetic valve is in a closed state; a tube receiving the steam from the electromagnetic valve, the tube being flexible; ... and an electric heater being disposed in the steam-blowing portion to heat a vaporization space of a steam passage in the steam-blowing portion, the electric heater changing water drops to steam in the vaporization space, the steam-blowing portion outputting steam and not water drops”, in combination with the other claimed features.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection of claims 1, 2, and 4 should be withdrawn.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn because the Examiner has relied on nonanalogous art.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/627,759
Response filed May 4, 2005
Reply to OA dated February 11, 2005

To rely on a reference under 35 USC 103, it must be analogous art.

In order to rely on a reference as a basis for rejection of an applicant's invention, the reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent the particular problem with which the inventor was concerned.

Sugo relates to a dental washer. **Langmuir** relates to a method and apparatus for producing aerosols. **Ohnishi** relates to a manufacturing method of semiconductors.

Applicant respectfully submits that no apparatus of **Sugo**, **Langmuir**, and **Ohnishi** relates to "a steam-supplying apparatus for hairdressing and beauty care" as set forth in claim 1.

Thus, because the Examiner has relied on nonanalogous art, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 2 has been amended to change "the" to --a-- (line 2) and to change "a" to --the-- (line 2), for conformity in view of claim 1, as amended.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **10/627,759**
Response filed May 4, 2005
Reply to OA dated February 11, 2005

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over **Sugo** in view of **Langmuir** or **Ohnishi**, and further in view of USP 5,803,938 (**Yamaguchi**).

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over **Sugo** in view of **Langmuir** or **Ohnishi**, and further in view of USP 6,647,204 (**Hutchinson**).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 3 and 5.

Hutchison and **Yamaguchi** fail to remedy the above-described deficiencies of **Sugo**, **Langmuir**, and **Ohnishi** regarding the base claims 1 and 4.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of claims 3 and 5 should be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, all claims currently being considered are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/627,759
Response filed May 4, 2005
Reply to OA dated February 11, 2005

below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP



Darren R. Crew
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 37,806

DRC/llf
Atty. Docket No. 030858
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE